Remarks

1. Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-5 and 7, and 9-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,943,620 ("Boltz") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,393,275 ("Alfred"). Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 6, 8, and 18 as unpatentable over Boltz in view of Alfred and further in view of what is well-known in the art as evidenced by U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0043763 ("Grayson").

2. Status of the Claims

Presently pending in this application are claims 2-5, 7-18 and 20, of which claims 2, 17, and 18 are independent and the remainder are dependent. Claims 2, 17 and 18 have been amended to more particularly point-out the claimed subject matter. Specifically, those claims now specifically recite that certain subscriber stations (or terminals) are arranged to respond to or ignore a termination signal having a common subscriber ID (or account number) included to identify the intended destination of the termination signal. Newly added claim 20 identifies the termination signal as a MIN-based termination signal.

The invention as recited in various ways in each of the pending claims provides a method for facilitating operation of multiple subscriber stations under a common subscriber ID. The method generally includes the functions of (i) maintaining a subscriber profile that associates multiple subscriber stations with a common subscriber ID; (ii) arranging a first subscriber station to respond to a predetermined type of termination signal; (iii) arranging the remaining subscriber stations to ignore the predetermined type of termination signal; (iv) using the subscriber profile to authorize an origination from any of

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
TELEPHONE (312) 913-0001

the subscriber stations; and (v) in response to a request to terminate a predetermined type of communication to the subscriber ID, broadcasting the predetermined type of termination signal having the subscriber ID included to identify the intended destination of the termination signal, whereby only the first subscriber station will respond to the termination signal.

Thus, according to the claims, *the broadcast termination signal includes the subscriber ID to identify the intended destination of the signal* and each subscriber station associated with the subscriber ID is individually configured to either respond to or ignore the broadcast termination signal. Even though each of the multiple subscriber stations is associated with the common subscriber ID and the termination signal includes the common subscriber ID to identify the intended destination, only one station is arranged to respond to the termination signal. However, the subscriber profile is arranged to authorize an origination from any of the multiple subscriber stations.

3. Response to §103(a) Rejections: The References Do Not Teach Broadcasting A Termination Signal Having The Subscriber ID Included To Identify The Intended Destination Of The Termination Signal

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention by applying a combination of references, the prior art must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. M.P.E.P. § 2143. Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejections because the asserted combinations fail to disclose or suggest the invention as a whole as recited in the claims.

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
TELEPHONE (312) 913-0001

The Examiner rejected independent claims 2 and 17 as nonobvious over Boltz in view of Alfred and rejected independent claim 18 as nonobvious over Boltz in view of Alfred in further view of what is well known in the art as evidenced by Grayson. The Examiner specifically relied on Boltz as the source of teachings regarding termination of a call.

The Boltz reference teaches having multiple subscriber stations associated with a common subscriber ID (MSISDN). In Boltz, each subscriber station is further identified by its respective IMSI number. When routing an incoming call to the subscriber ID, Boltz teaches that the call is routed to a primary mobile station via its IMSI number.

Thus, Boltz teaches the use of an identivier, an IMSI, that uniquely identifies the intended destination of a call. In contrast, the claims of the present application are directed to the use of a subscriber ID that is associated with multiples subscriber stations to identifier the intended destination. In particular, each independent claim recites some form of *broadcasting a termination signal having the subscriber ID included to identify the intended destination of the termination signal*. Rather than being routed to a specific IMSI number, the termination signal is broadcast with reference to the subscriber ID and each subscriber terminal associated with the subscriber ID is individually configured to either respond or ignore the termination signal. Thus, as described in the specification each remaining subscriber station may "receive and not respond to the general page message." Specification, page 19, lines 12-13.

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
TELEPHONE (312) 913-0001

Consequently, a major distinction between these two approaches is that the claimed invention recites broadcasting the termination signal and interpreting that signal according to the respond/ignore arrangements at each individual terminal while Boltz simply routes the call to a specific "preferred" terminal via an IMSI number identified by a server/database (e.g., HLR 50) acting at the level of the service provider.

Grayson also teaches that devices can "ignore communications which do not contain their network and node addresses . . . [Thus,] every product within a network can be addressed individually using its node address." Grayson, page 2, paragraph 21. Like Boltz, the teaching of Grayson is inapplicable to the claimed invention because Grayson indicates that any communication should be uniquely identified with a particular node (terminal). *Conversely, the claims recite that the broadcast uses the non-unique "subscriber ID" to identify the intended destination of the termination signal rather than using any particular unique ID associated with a subscriber terminal.* Alfred provides no further teaching in this area.

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
TELEPHONE (312) 913-0001

4. Conclusion

Because the combinations of Boltz, Alfred and Grayson fail to disclose or suggest all the elements as recited in each of independent claims 2, 17, and 18, Applicant submits that those claims and their dependent claims are clearly allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF

Dated: Aug 16, 2005

By: _____

Dennis D. Crouch
Reg. No. 55,091

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
TELEPHONE (312) 913-0001